allowed him to be affected without seeming so and to appear witty. He would never stop talking except to draw on his cigar.

"You didn't leave Paris this summer?'* M. P, nevertheless risked asking him during a puff of silence.

"I don't like changing beds," J. A. declared sharply as one utters an aphorism. "But when you have your own yacht, perhaps . . .* (J. A. is rolling in money, but he likes letting it be understood that he could endure being even richer.) "But the country! Do *you* find any fun in the country?"

#

In the jury-box again I look at my colleagues. I imagine these same faces on the opposite bench; badly outfitted, unshaved, unwashed, their hair uncombed, with soiled linen or with none at all, and that fearful hunted look in the eyes that comes from a combination of worry and fatigue, What would they look like? What would I look like myself? Would the judge himself recognize under that frightful disguise the "respectable man'? He would have to be very clever to distinguish the criminal from the member of the jury!

Jules Lemaitre's toast to the Duke of Orleans moved me, I confess; in a few sentences he evoked an image of the master that any country whatever might long for, as soon as it longs for a master.

At first I was saddened not to find the same masculine dignity, the same sincere conciseness, in the letter that the Duke of Orleans sends to him. But the reservations I then made do not hold, upon reflection. The important thing is not that a prince should talk well, but rather that he should surround himself with men possessing the qualities that he recognizes he lacks. And moreover, in our epoch, who can say how much the authority of a king would be reduced, just how far the Chambers

would limit his initiative? And, indeed, haven't we the right to demand greater personal merit from the representatives of a republic than from the representative of a monarchy? Renan's witticism about Louis-Philippe: "One must forgive kings their mediocrity; they didn't choose themselves/' is not necessarily disrespectful.

But, alas, it is just that reassuring limitation of royal power that worries me; everything depends on the value of the areopagus that limits it, and so long as universal suffrage decides the matter, we shall not have changed masters. The king wffl be a king only when he has freed us from that. Can a long do so, and to free us from it is a king really necessary?